



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,830	03/07/2001	Yoshie Noborimoto	SONYJP 3.0-143	3654

7590 02/15/2007
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK,LLP
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090-1497

EXAMINER

ROSEN, NICHOLAS D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,830

Applicant(s)

NOBORIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/7/2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 and 4-18 have been examined.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 11, 2007 (and received January 16) has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, and 9

Claims 1, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,151,707) in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent 6,018,719) and official notice. As per claim 1, Hecksel discloses an information processing apparatus, comprising: a customer data unit operable to receive from a user terminal a registration code identifying a purchased product and information relating to a purchaser of the product that are inputted at the user terminal by the purchaser when the purchaser seeks to register the product, and discloses determining whether a customer identifier is associated with the product, and storing the purchaser information and the registration code in association with the customer identifier (column 1, lines 21-46; column 4, line 43-59; column 7, lines 32-60; column 8, lines 45-64; Figure 2b; the data unit operable to receive being inherent from the data having been received) and obtaining a customer identifier when the customer identifier is not already associated with purchaser information (column 4, lines 43-59; column 5, lines 23-61). Hecksel does not expressly disclose determining whether the registration code is correct, but determining whether a number is correct is well known, as taught by Rogers (column 5, lines 9-67). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to determine whether the registration code was correct, for the obvious advantage of avoiding the many errors which could result from relying on information for the wrong product or the wrong customer.

Hecksel discloses receiving and storing purchaser responses to a first questionnaire that is available to the purchaser at a time when the purchaser provides

Art Unit: 3625

the registration code and the purchaser information (column 1, lines 21-46, as prior art; column 5, lines 23-61, implying at least some questions; column 8, lines 45-64), and transmitting a second questionnaire to the purchaser at his user terminal at a predetermined time subsequent to the receipt and storage of the registration code and purchaser information (column 6, lines 14-46); Hecksel is not entirely explicit about storing purchaser responses to the second questionnaire, but this is held to be obvious in that it would be absurd to gather the responses and then throw them all away; storing the responses would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the obvious advantages of learning how to improve the product, and/or sell it and other products more effectively.

Hecksel discloses determining whether to transmit an interview questionnaire and update survey questions to the purchaser at his user terminal based on at least part of the purchaser information and other information (column 6, lines 14-46; column 8, lines 45-64; column 9, lines 11-27), receiving from the user terminal purchaser responses that the purchaser has inputted at the user terminal in response to an interview questionnaire information (column 6, lines 14-46; column 8, lines 45-64; column 9, lines 11-27), and combining results obtained from the purchaser to output data (column 8, lines 4-12; column 9, lines 17-27). Hecksel is not explicit about making the determination based also on responses obtained from other purchasers, but official notice is taken that it is well known to combine responses and output data (e.g., for marketing) based on combined responses from multiple purchasers or other persons surveyed. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of

Art Unit: 3625

electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to combine responses from other purchasers and output data based on the combined responses, for the obvious advantages of enabling a manufacturer or distributor to improve its products and/or marketing based on purchaser responses (if the data is output to the manufacturer or distributor); and for the obvious advantage of presenting suitable questions or statements to the purchaser, such as asking him whether he has experienced problems which other purchasers report, recommending that he buy additional products which other purchasers who have characteristics in common with him have bought, etc. (if the data is output to the purchaser).

As per claim 6, Hecksel discloses identifying a customer and accessing his files (column 9, lines 48-52), but does not expressly disclose a customer identifier providing unit operable to receive a request for the customer identifier from the customer data unit, and to provide the customer identifier to the data unit in response to the request, but official notice is taken that it is well known to receive a request for identification data and to provide such identification data. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the information processing apparatus comprise such a customer identifier providing unit, for the obvious advantage of making customer identifier data available to the customer data unit.

As per claim 7, Hecksel does not disclose a conversion unit operable to convert the stored purchaser information the stored purchaser information, purchaser responses, etc. into a format suitable for the questionnaire data processing unit, but

official notice is taken that conversion units for converting data into a suitable format are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have the information processing apparatus comprise such a conversion unit, for the obvious advantage of converting data into a format in which it can be readily used.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel, Rogers, and official notice as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jolissaint et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,149) and Sweat ("Web Ties That Bind"). As per claim 8, Hecksel does not expressly disclose a call center terminal operable to receive a subject of a customer inquiry together with the customer identifier, but Jolissaint teaches a call center terminal operable to receive a subject of a customer inquiry together with the customer identifier; a call center data unit operable to receive the customer identifier from the call center terminal to receive stored information about the customer, and to output the information to the call center terminal in response to the received customer identifier; and an answer collection unit operable to receive the customer inquiry and customer information from the call center terminal (or data unit) and to output the associated answer to the customer inquiry (column 1, line 50, through column 2, line 35; column 3, lines 28-47; column 6, line 48, through column 7, line 35). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to include such call center apparatus, and to include the particular information recited, for the stated advantage of providing a call center agent with the information he needs to effectively assist a customer.

Sweat ("Web Ties That Bind") teaches determining whether answers associated with customer inquiries are recorded in an answer collection database, the determination being based on the subject of the customer inquiry (paragraph beginning, "Dell's call-center reps have even begun"). Hecksel does not disclose the answer collection database being further operable to increment an inquiry count for the associated answer, but official notice is taken that incrementing a count is well known. Sweat further implies the call center terminal being operable to display the associated answer (the three paragraphs beginning from, "If, for instance, a Carlson customer," and the three paragraphs following "Corporate Help Goes Online"), and in particular teaches storing data, presumably including customer inquiries and associated answers, in a database (see especially the paragraph beginning, "Meanwhile, Pilot's York likes that Octane 99"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to do these things, for the stated advantages of identifying customers' concerns and adding appropriate answers to the database, and making all appropriate information readily available to customer service agents; and for the obvious advantage of identifying customers' concerns which are being met, more or less, and discovering which answers are being called upon often.

Neither Hecksel, Jolissaint, nor Sweat expressly discloses storing the customer inquiry and the reply in association with the customer identifier, but official notice is taken that it is well known to store interactions with customers, appropriately identified. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic

Art Unit: 3625

commerce at the time of applicant's invention to store the customer inquiry and the reply in association with the customer identifier, for the obvious advantages of better being able to serve that particular customer, e.g., by following up on reports of problems, or selling additional products in which the customer has expressed an interest; and of better serving other customers, e.g., by adding an inquiry to a FAQ list, correcting an unwanted feature of the product which has led to numerous questions and complaints, advertising to customers an additional product in which many have expressed an interest, etc.

As per claim 9, neither Hecksel nor Jolissaint expressly discloses receiving the stored customer inquiry and the stored associated answer from the call center data unit (although Sweat teaches that even chat conversations get posted as incidents, and these would often involve customer inquires and associated answers, paragraph beginning, "Meanwhile, Pilot's York likes that Octane 99"), and to combine information based on the customer inquiry and reply with other information based on other customer inquires and replies, and to output data based on the combined information, but official notice is taken that it is well known to combine responses and output data (e.g., for marketing) based on combined responses from multiple customers or other persons surveyed. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to combine information based the customer's inquiry and the reply with similar data from other customers, for the obvious advantages of enabling a manufacturer or distributor to improve its products and/or marketing based on customer inquiries (if the data is output to the manufacturer

or distributor); and for the obvious advantage of presenting suitable questions or statements to the purchaser, such as asking him whether he has experienced problems which other purchasers report, recommending that he buy additional products which other purchasers who have characteristics in common with him have bought, etc.

Neither Hecksel nor Sweat discloses generating and displaying at least one of the three kinds of diagrams listed, but official notice is taken that it is well known to generate and display diagrams from data; hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to generate and display at least one of the diagrams, or the plurality of diagrams, recited, for the obvious advantage of making the information readily visible to users of the system.

Claims 4, 10, 11, and 12

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,151,707) in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent 6,018,719) and official notice. As per claim 4, claim 4 is essentially parallel to claim 1, and rejected on the same grounds.

As per claim 10, claim 10 is essentially parallel to claim 7, and rejected on the same grounds.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel, Rogers, and official notice as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Jolissaint et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,149) and Sweat ("Web Ties That Bind"). Claims 11 and 12 are largely parallel to claims 8 and 9, respectively, except that claims 11 and

12 are broader. Claims 11 and 12 are therefore rejected on essentially the same grounds set forth above in rejecting claims 8 and 9, respectively.

Claims 5, 13, 14, and 15

Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,151,707) in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent 6,018,719) and official notice. As per claim 5, claim 5 is essentially parallel to claim 1, and rejected on the same grounds.

As per claim 13, claim 13 is essentially parallel to claim 7, and rejected on the same grounds.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel, Rogers, and official notice as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Jolissaint et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,149) and Sweat ("Web Ties That Bind"). Claims 14 and 15 are parallel to claims 11 and 12, respectively, and rejected on the same grounds.

Claim 16, 17, and 18

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,151,707) in view of Rogers et al. (U.S. Patent 6,018,719) and official notice. Claim 16 largely corresponds to claim 1, and is found obvious on the same grounds. Additionally, Hecksel does not expressly disclose a terminal operable to display a menu that permits a purchaser to select between registering a purchased product and responding to a first questionnaire, to display one or more screens suitable

Art Unit: 3625

for obtaining a registration code identifying the purchased product and information relating to the purchaser of the product when the purchaser selects registering the purchased product, and to display one or more screens suitable for obtaining responses to the first questionnaire when the customer selects responding to the first questionnaire. However, official notice is taken that it is well known for people to use computer terminals operable to display menus and screens; as Hecksel discloses receiving questionnaires and entering data by computer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have customers use terminals operable to display appropriate menus and screens, for the obvious advantage of enabling Hecksel's disclosed procedures to be readily carried out.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hecksel, Rogers, and official notice as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Jolissaint et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,149) and Sweat ("Web Ties That Bind"). Claims 14 and 15 are parallel to claims 8 and 9, respectively, and rejected on the same grounds.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 11, 2007 (and received January 16) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Hecksel teaches away from having the user enter registration information (column 1, lines 33-47). Examiner reiterates that this is Hecksel's description of the prior art, over which his

Art Unit: 3625

own invention is offered as an improvement, and therefore does not qualify as teaching away. Applicant argues that Hecksel, in his detailed description of his own invention, further teaches away from having the user enter registration information, quoting Hecksel as describing how his system "alleviates the tedious and error prone task of data entry" (column 5). Examiner replies that this describes saving the user from having to re-enter the same information again and again; Hecksel does not teach away from the user entering first information, perhaps including registration information, the first time, nor teach away from the user entering other information in response to later questionnaires and surveys.

If Applicant wishes to continue to maintain that Examiner is in error on this point, it might be helpful for Applicant to point out where in the Hecksel patent the user is described as not having to enter any information. Examiner has not found the appropriate passage or drawing.

Applicant's subsequent arguments essentially depend on the basis discussed above, where Examiner has not found Applicant's arguments persuasive, and argues against them; therefore, it is not necessary to answer the subsidiary points in detail.

Examiner agrees that Hecksel does disclose the new limitations of claim 9 and the claims parallel to it, but has taken official notice that it is well known to generate and display diagrams. Computer software packages that turn data into corresponding bar, pie, or other graphs are well known, and Applicant does not claim to be the inventor of them.

Art Unit: 3625

The common knowledge or well-known in the art statements in the previous office action are taken to be admitted prior art, because Applicant did not traverse Examiner's taking of official notice.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith, can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-273-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas D. Rosen

**NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

February 12, 2007